



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/523,350	03/10/2000	Hiroyuki Kino	36856.283	5246

7590

09/24/2003

Joseph R Keating Esquire  
Keating & Bennett LLP  
10400 Eaton Place Suite 312  
Fairfax, VA 22030

EXAMINER

KIM, PAUL D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3729

DATE MAILED: 09/24/2003

25

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/523,350

Applicant(s)

KINO ET AL.

Examiner

Paul D Kim

Art Unit

3729

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1, 2, 5, 6, 8, 10-16, 18 and 20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
PETER VO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the prior art of record fails to disclose the claimed invention such as attaching an organic powder between the compact bodies. Applicant Admitted Prior Art teaches all the claimed invention except the organic powder in between the bodies. Examiner traverses the argument that even though Matsumoto et al. does not teach the magnetic material bodies, Matsumoto et al. teach a process of forming ZrO<sub>2</sub> powder in between the ceramic bodies. After the sintering process, the metal Zr is remained in between the ceramic bodies. It would be obvious to use ZrO<sub>2</sub> powder as taught by Matsumoto et al. in between the magnetic material bodies of Applicant Admitted Prior Art for preventing bond-sticking during the firing step.

Also, Applicant argues that the prior art of record fails to disclose the claimed invention such as attaching the bodies to one another that axes of the through-hole bodies are aligned vertically. Examiner traverses the argument that even though the ceramic bodies of Matsumoto et al. do not have the through-holes in bodies to stack vertically, It would be obvious to stack the magnetic material bodies of Applicant Admitted Prior Art vertically as taught by Matsumoto et al. to minimize a contact surface of the bodies to reduce deforming such as cracking during the firing step..